

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 2, 6-14, and 16-25 are pending in the application and that claims 1, 2, 6-14 and 16-25 are rejected. By the response filed August 12, 2005, claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 16, 21, 22, and 24-25 have been amended. Thus, claims 1, 2, 6-14, and 16-25 were pending in this application. In the Advisory Action dated August 29, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-14 and 16-25, indicating that the proposed amendments raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and that the amendments are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. According to the Examiner, the claim amendments introduce new issues that would require further search and consideration. Accordingly, the proposed amendments were not entered and the present amendment is submitted herein via a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) to enter the amendments into the application file history.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 6-14 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yan et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,003,065) and *Inoue et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,456,388). Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yan et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,003,065) and *Inoue et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,456,388), as applied to claim 21 above, and *Iwase et al.* (U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0097262). Independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 have been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) obviousness rejection. Claims 6, 14, 22, and 24 have been amended to conform with the amendments made to the respective independent claims.

Independent claims 1, 10, 16, and 21 have each been amended to include features not taught or suggested by the cited prior art references, as detailed below. With respect to independent claims 1 (and dependent claims 2 and 6-9, *Yan et al.* and *Inoue et al.* do not teach or suggest, "the loading mechanism is configured to deliver the first application in a first, dedicated servlet to the one appliance and deliver the second application in a second,

dedicated servlet to the another appliance where the second, dedicated servlet is unique from the first, dedicated servlet" (see p. 10, II.4-7) and "and the application loader is configured to automatically update one of the first dedicated servlet and the second dedicated servlet responsive to a user locally changing desired settings for one of the first computer peripheral and the second computer peripheral, respectively, and one of the first and second application bodies is configured to execute when one of a user and a selected one of the computer peripherals accesses the respective application body at the URL to download at least one of the appliance packages, and at least one of the appliance configuration settings; and to change configuration of the respective computer peripherals on the web application server" (see p. 9, II. 1-5 and p. 8, II. 22-31) in combination with the remaining limitations of claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 10 (and dependent claims 11-15), *Yan et al.* and *Inoue et al.* do not teach or suggest, "an application loader is configured to deliver a first application in a first, dedicated servlet to one computer peripheral and deliver a second application in a second, dedicated servlet to another computer peripheral where the second, dedicated servlet is unique from the first, dedicated servlet" (see p. 10, II.4-7) and "the application loader is configured to automatically update one of the first dedicated servlet and the second dedicated servlet responsive to a user locally changing desired settings for one of the first computer peripheral and the second computer peripheral, respectively, and one of the first and second application bodies is configured to execute when one of a user and a selected one of the computer peripherals accesses the respective application body at the URL to download at least one of the appliance packages, and at least one of the appliance configuration settings; and to change configuration of the respective computer peripherals on the web application server" (see p. 9, II. 1-5 and p. 8, II. 22-31) in combination with the remaining limitations of claim 10.

With respect to independent claim 16 (and dependent claims 17-20), *Yan et al.* and *Inoue et al.* do not teach or suggest, "changing desired user settings for one of the one appliance and the another appliance locally of the respective appliance" (see p. 8, II. 22-31) and "automatically updating one of the first dedicated servlet and the second dedicated servlet responsive to a user

locally changing desired user settings for one of the one appliance and the another appliance, respectively" (see p. 9, II. 1-5) in combination with the remaining limitations of claim 16.

With respect to independent claim 21 (and dependent claims 22-25), *Yan et al.* and *Inoue et al.* (and with respect to claims 23-25, *Iwase et al.*) do not teach or suggest, "a loading mechanism provided on the network-based appliance and operative to deliver the first application in a first, dedicated servlet to one appliance and deliver the second application in a second, dedicated servlet to another appliance where the second, dedicated servlet is unique from the first, dedicated servlet" (see p. 10, II.4-7) in combination with the remaining limitations of claim 21.

The above recitations of claim limitations are believed to overcome the Examiner's argument that the response complies with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) and are believed to be more than general allegations that the claims define a patentable invention.

Accordingly, it is believed that the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is believed to be overcome by the amendments to the claims as indicated above.

Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview before issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,
Loay Abu-Husein, Inventor

Date:

9/15/05

By:


Keith D. Grzelak
Reg. No. 37,144

(509) 624-4276